

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Lucas on the Osteology of the Paridæ, Sitta, and Chamæa.* — In this paper Mr. Lucas passes in review the principal osteological characters of these groups. The genera Parus, Auriparus, Ægithalus, and Psaltriparus, differ much from each other in cranial characters, and form a group much less homogeneous than the Swallows, Wrens, or Thrushes. Sitta differs so much from any of the Titmice that it seems proper to place it in a separate family from the Paridæ. Chamæa, as previously pointed out by Dr. Shufeldt (see Auk, VII, p. 278), appears to find its nearest relative in Psaltriparus, and not with the Wrens, as Mr. Lucas was formerly inclined to believe (see Auk, VII, p. 277). "It appears, then," says Mr. Lucas, "that in its cranial characters Chamæa is much like Psaltriparus, while the shoulder girdle is slightly, and the pelvic girdle decidedly, Wrenlike. . . . On the other hand, none of the characters shown in the skeleton of Chamæa seems sufficient to warrant placing the genus either with the Wrens or Tits, but rather bear out the intermediate position indicated in the name Wren-tit." - J. A. A.

Lucas on the Structure of the Tongue in Hummingbirds.†—The tongue of the Hummingbird has generally been supposed to be tubular, but Mr. Lucas shows that this is not so, in a strict sense. Towards the tip "the tongue becomes forked, each division being a rod bordered by a wide flange of thin membrane," which curls upward and inward, so that toward the apex two very delicate parallel tubes are formed. The tubular part, however, "exists only for a short distance towards the anterior end, so that the common statement that the tongue of the Humming-bird consists of two parallel muscular tubes is quite erroneous." The width of the bordering membranes is found to vary in different genera. "Certainly there can be no sucking in the proper meaning of the word, since no vacuum can be formed at the back of the tongue, and liquids probably pass through the tubular portion by capillary attraction." A plate and figures in the text aid in giving a very clear idea of this peculiar mechanism.— J. A. A.

Lucas on the Bird Skeletons Collected by the U. S. Fish Commission Steamer 'Albatross.' — These skeletons represent 33 species, mostly water birds, including *Creagrus furcatus*. A few notes are given on the osteology of the four species of Cormorants collected. — J. A. A.

^{*}Notes on the Osteology of the Paridæ, Sitta, and Chamæa. By Frederic A. Lucas. Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., XIII, 1890, pp. 337-345, pl. xxvii.

[†]On the Structure of the Tongue in Hummingbirds. By Frederic A. Lucas. Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., XIV, 1891, pp. 167-172, pl. iv.

[‡] Scientific Results of Explorations by the U. S. Fish Commission Steamer Albatross. XIII. Catalogue of Skeletons of Birds Collected at the Abrolhos Islands, Brazil, the Straits of Magellan, and the Galapagos Islands, in 1887-88. By Frederic A. Lucas. Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., XIII, 1890, pp. 127-130.